



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,368	01/30/2002	Christopher Jean Seiler	6647-29	4539
45842	7590	01/05/2007	EXAMINER	
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - NOVELL 210 SW MORRISON STREET SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204			SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/05/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/066,368	SEILER ET AL.
	Examiner Thomas E. Shortledge	Art Unit 2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Remarks, filed 10/26/2006.
2. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 are pending. Claims 5, 11, 12, 20, 21, 29, 30 and 33 are cancelled.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 10/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues as to claims 1, 6, 15 and 24 (Remarks, page 11) that Fogarty (US 6,311,180 B1) in view of Yu (2004/0205118) do not disclose nor suggest using the browser to determine a language that might be included in the language ranking. The examiner disagrees and argues that Fogarty teaches that Fogarty teaches a browser, and teaches selecting a language based on the display localization process, where based on the display, special fonts, display characteristics and text strings are used to determine which and how to display a language (col. 6, lines 45-62).

The applicant argues as to claims 3 and 38 (Remarks, pages 12 and 14) that Fogarty in view of Yu do not disclose nor suggest a container hierarchy, the container hierarchy including at least a first container, the first container including a second

container, the second container including a directory entry; and the second container including a default language. The examiner disagrees and argues that Fogarty teaches a hierarchical database structure storing languages the user is able to understand, first storing a location, under the location entry, storing directory entries for each user (for example, under the location Texas, each user is stored), for each directory entry a default language is stored (col. 7, lines 55-67, and col. 8 lines 1-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-19, 22-28, 31-32 and 34-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fogarty in view of (6,311,180) in view of Yu (2004/0205118).

As to claim 1, Fogarty teaches:

a computer (a target device such as a cell phone, col. 5 line 10);

a directory entry for the user, the directory entry stored in the computer and including identity information for the user (user profile input stored on the target device, col. 6, lines 1-9);

means for determining browser information for a browser stored on the second computer (a browser, and selecting a language based on the display localization process, where based on the display, special fonts, display characteristics and text strings are used to determine which and how to display a language, col. 6, lines 45-62);

a ranker for ranking a plurality of languages based on at least the directory entry, the location information, and the browser information and a selector for selecting one of the plurality of languages with a highest rank (based on a user profile and locations and display information, languages are ranked, and the highest ranking language is selected, col. 7, line 55 through col. 8, line 8).

Fogarty teaches location information (col. 7, lines 60-64), however, Fogarty does not teach a first and second computer nor location information for a location from which the first computer can be accessed.

However, Yu teaches a first and second computer (a computer connected to the Internet, page 3, paragraph 29, where the computer connected to the internet would necessarily contain two or more computers) and geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (page 3, paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the location identification

methods of Yu to allow correctly configured web pages to be sent to the user, as taught by Yu (page 3, paragraph 30).

As to claim 2, Fogarty teaches the identify information includes the language (the user profile includes language information, col. 6, lines 1-10).

As to claim 3, Fogarty teaches a container hierarchy including at least a first container (storing languages the user is able to understand, col. 7, lines 55-60), the first container including a second container (storing location for the user each location having specific language information, col. 7, line 60 through col. 8, line 4), the second container including the directory entry (directory entries for each user that is located in Texas, col. 7, lines 60-67); and the second container including a default language (the default language for Texas being English, col. 7, lines 60-67).

As to claim 4, Fogarty teaches the directory entry can inherit the default language from the second container (the default language, English, can be applied to users located in Texas, col. 7, line 60, through col. 8, line 4).

As to claims 6, 15 and 24, Fogarty teaches a computer-readable modulated carrier signal (connecting the user to the internet, col. 4, lines 55-58);

logging the user into a first computer from a second computer with login information , using the login information to identify a directory entry for the user (login the user into the Internet through a first computer (col. 4, lines 35-40) storing numerous user profiles on display device, (col. 4, lines 55-58), where it would be necessary for a user to login to a device for a specific profile to be selected);

determining a first language from the directory entry from the user; determining a second language based on a location of the user (determining a first and second language that a user can understand, col. 7, lines 51-59);

determining a third language from a browser (a browser, and selecting a language based on the display localization process, where based on the display, special fonts, display characteristics and text strings are used to determine which and how to display a language, col. 6, lines 45-62);

ranking the first, second and third languages; and selecting a highest ranked language as the preferred language (a prioritization process for ranking the languages in the user profile and the display localization language, then selecting the highest ranking language, col. 7, line 59 through col. 8, line 8).

Fogarty does not teach a location of the user at the second computer.

However, Yu teaches geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (page 3, paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the location identification

methods of Yu to allow correctly configured web pages to be sent to the user, as taught by Yu (page 3, paragraph 30).

As to claims 7, 16 and 25, Fogarty teaches determining the first language includes determining the language from an identity information stored in the directory entry for the user (determining a language from the personal information of the user, col. 7, line 61, through col. 8, line 5).

As to claims 8, 17 and 26, Fogarty teaches accessing the directory entry for the user from the first computer (accessing the user profile stored in the directory, col. 4, lines 55-58); and locating the identity information in the directory entry (locating the user location information within the user profile, col. 7, lines 55 through col. 8, line 5).

As to claims 9, 18 and 27, Fogarty teaches determining the first language includes determining that no language is specified in the identity information in the directory entry, and the method further comprises inheriting the first language from a container of the directory entry (users who do not indicate a language, a locale specific prioritization process compares the languages used for the text portion with the languages used in the locale where the user lives, and selects a corresponding language, col. 7, line 61 through col. 8, line 4).

As to claim 10, 19, and 28, Fogarty teaches identifying a default language (col. 7, lines 60-67); however, Fogarty does not teach determining the second language includes determining the location of the user at the second computer.

However, Yu teaches geographic information indicating the location of the user, from the user's Internet Protocol (IP) address (page 3, paragraph 29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the methods of Fogarty with the teachings of Yu to allow correctly configured web pages to be sent to the user, as taught by Yu (page 3, paragraph 30).

As to claims 13, 22 and 31, Fogarty teaches using the preferred language to display the content to the user (outputting the document in a language the user can understand, col. 6, lines 5-10).

As to claims 14, 23 and 32, Fogarty teaches using the preferred language includes sending the preferred language in a packet header from the first computer to a content provider (fig. 1, shows communicating between a database, a app. server communicating with a web server, where language information can be sent from the database to the web server to properly display a page, where it would be necessary that an internet connection is used, a packet header would be used to send information to the content provider).

As to claim 34, Fogarty teaches the identity information further includes a second language (natural languages that user can read are listed, col. 6, lines 1-8, where it would be necessary that since the languages is plural a second language would be present).

As to claims 35, 36 and 37, Fogarty teaches determining a first language from the directory entry for the user includes determining the first language and a third language from the directory entry for the user (determining a first, second and third language from the profile of the user saved in the database, col. 7, line 50 through col. 8, line 8).

As to claim 38, Fogarty teaches the first container includes a second default language, and the directory entry can inherit the second default language from the first container (in view of the rejection of claim 3, Fogarty also teaches a second default language for different locations, col. 8, lines 1-8).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TS
12/29/2006



RICHMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER